



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS

La Critica dei Poeti Romani in Orazio. By CARLO PASCAL.
Catania: Francesco Battiato, 1919. Pp. 144. Lire 3.50.

The essays in this volume deal with Ennius, Plautus, Lucilius, Catullus, Pollio, Tibullus, Propertius. They have all appeared before in periodicals (most of them in *Athenaeum*), except those on Plautus and Lucilius. That on Catullus appeared also in Pascal's *Poeti e personaggi Catulliani* (reviewed at length in the *American Journal of Philology*, XXXVII, 481 ff.). There is also a general Introduction and a Conclusion.

In the Introduction Pascal sets forth the principles or preconceptions which he believes guided Horace as a literary critic. The most important is the belief in the absolute perfection of Greek art. Out of this belief grew Horace's contempt for the simple art of ancient Italy. To the roughness of this art Horace opposes his own *urbanitas*, another of his guiding principles. In Pascal's definition *urbanitas* almost becomes a supercilious snobbishness which fails to appreciate the virile qualities of primitive art. Pascal also observes that Horace discusses only the defects of the poets he mentions. Another preconception he attributes to Horace is due to friendship: Horace cared only for the favorable comments of his friends. But Pascal fails to note that the basis of this friendship was agreement on literary and stylistic principles.

In the Conclusion, Pascal argues that Horace's attitude was determined by the struggle between nationalism and Hellenism which in his time was going on in all phases of life. According to this view, Horace threw in his lot with the Hellenists. This seems to me to be a wrong conception: Horace took a middle ground here and attacked both extremes. The poetry of the Augustan age seems to me to represent such a compromise.

The weakness of Pascal's views is due, in my opinion, to two factors: (1) that no allowance is made for modification of Horace's point of view between the time of the *Satires* and of the *Epistles*; (2) that poets as different in time, temperament, and training as Ennius, Plautus, Lucilius, and Catullus are grouped together.

With regard to the older poets, Ennius and Lucilius, Horace's attitude, it seems to me, is not that of entire depreciation. He merely points out that they are human, like himself, that they make mistakes—even Homer nods—that, conversely, there are good qualities in modern poetry. Horace is attacking in many cases not the ancient poets, as Pascal at times assumes,

but those critics who would canonize and even deify them. His attitude toward Ennius is decidedly friendly (*Serm.* i. 4. 60 ff.), though Pascal rather depreciates this.

In the chapter on Plautus there is a full discussion of the passage in *Hor. Epist.* ii. 1. 57 ff., where Afranius, Plautus, Caecilius, and Terence are mentioned. By a rather attractive interpretation of a fragment of Afranius this writer is credited with applying the term "Latin Menander" to Terence before Cicero and Caesar did. We must agree with Pascal that Horace's attitude toward Plautus, as far as it is expressed, is thoroughly unfavorable.

The chapter on Lucilius is, from my prejudiced point of view, unsatisfactory, as it does not even mention certain interpretations, which seem to me more than plausible, of passages in the fourth and tenth satires (see *T.A.P.A.*, XLVIII, 111 ff., and *Classical Philology*, X, 270 ff.), though these articles are mentioned in an introductory footnote. Examples are *Serm.* i. 4. 21-22 and i. 10. 11-14. Considerable space is given to Lucilius' use of Greek words, which Horace criticizes. Pascal's defense of Lucilius is not convincing. The rest of the chapter is devoted to Horace's indebtedness to Lucilius. Fiske's notable book (*Lucilius and Horace*) appeared too late to be used by Pascal.

Pascal adopts the common view that Horace is hostile to Catullus and explains this hostility as due to jealousy. My views differ widely from his (*Classical Philology*, X, 270 ff.). In the chapter on Pollio, Pascal tries to show that Pollio and Catullus were at variance and that this fact created a bond of sympathy between Pollio and Horace. Catullus' poem 12 is interpreted as unfriendly to Pollio. This is hard to believe.

As Pascal points out, Horace does not pass judgment on the poetry of Tibullus directly. There is little that is new in the chapter on Tibullus. My article, "Horace and Tibullus" (*American Journal of Philology*, XXXIII [1912], 149 ff.), seems to be unknown to Pascal. A new and unconvincing suggestion, based on *Epist.* i. 4, is that Tibullus was a Stoic. The reference to Cassius Parmensis in the same poem is interpreted as a jest, as I took it.

The chapter on Propertius goes over familiar ground. It concludes, however, with a new argument to show that Horace had only contempt for this poet. After citing the familiar passage in *Epist.* ii. 2. 91 ff. supposed to contain a reference to Propertius, Pascal quotes Asconius to the effect that the poets of the time (Varius, Tucca, Horace, Gallus, Propertius) all honored Virgil, though they were jealous of one another. By a process of elimination Pascal concludes that Horace and Propertius were among the guilty ones.

In general, then, we have a very useful collection of the material bearing on Horace's attitude toward some of the most important Latin poets, with an occasional new interpretation which is suggestive, but without due consideration of recent literature.

B. L. ULLMAN